MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS;

THE TWENTY-FIRST CALL, MONDAY AUGUST 3, 1936.

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1937 was held in the Court Room, at the office of Delano, Lescaze and Hamlin, 101 Park Avenue, Monday August 3, 1936.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Delano,
Mr. Morris,
Mr. Tittle,
Mr. Walker,

also, Mr. F. H. Bohmfalk, Secretary and Executive Officer.

There were also present Mr. Lawrence Grant White and Mr. H. J. Adams, representing Adams, Howe and White, architects, Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer, and Mr. John I. Tuthill, Designing Engineer, of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission; also Mr. James E. Fraser, former sculptor member of the Commission.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 P.M. (Daylight saving time).

1. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE, GRANITE FOR THE "CENTRAL PANELS": Under date of August 1, 1936, a letter was received from Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer, of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, with enclosure of correspondence (Exhibit A), requesting the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to problems that have arisen in the matter of providing granite for the Memorial Bridge, different kinds of granite having been suggested for it. The Commission gave them very careful consideration.

In presenting the subject Colonel Grant said "two things entered into

that I recommend, one was the cost. If we had $15,000 less to work with it will only be that much something else that is perhaps more important; also the fact that we are supposed to accept the lowest bid unless there is some real important reason for not doing it. The other thing is that we have so far nothing but Vermont granite in the bridge and there is sentimental reason for wanting to get northern granite into the appurtenances of the bridge, and the time to do it is when the bids are such as to justify this. We didn't have northern granite for the main bridge because this would be very much higher. It was a matter of $5 more/cubic, that we could not allow the sentiment to be worth that much; but we do think that it would be very nice if the prices would allow some northern granite into the bridge. We think the bridge is symbolical of the North and the South. The suggestion is to accept what seems to be the lowest combination of bids for the granite of the "Channel Bridge", namely

Part I, Mount Airy, North Carolina granite (below elevation 15)
Part II and III, Wallowell (N Hmp) granite (footpaths and ashlar)
Parts IV and V, Bethel White (Vermont) (for coping and balustrade)

I think Bethel granite would be suitable for the coping and balustrade, because the 'Channel Bridge' is fully 650 feet away from the main bridge, and will thus not be noticed much in comparing it with the granite of the bridge proper. The architects of the Memorial Bridge, however, want Mount Airy granite used continuously for the balustrade from the Lincoln Memorial to Arlington, but agree to the use of other stone for other parts of the 'Channel Bridge'.

Samples of the granite in question were submitted to me. White and ice-jected,--Mount Airy, Wallowell and Bethel granite. Attention was called to the fact that each one of the balustrades ends in a big pylon. There would be granite also around the Columbia Island Plaza. Colonel Grant against

emphasized the fact that $10,000 to $10,000 might not be a large sum involved in this instance, but that it might seriously affect getting bids in the future, as granite firms would be apt to think that Mount Airy granite had been agreed upon for the bridge ~~[illegible]~~ and it would therefore be useless for them to compete. There is still 1400 feet of stone to be ordered for the steps and 1500 feet for the plaza, in addition to miscellaneous quantities for the bridge.

Colonel Grant called attention to the granite in the National Museum, where there is Bethel and Mount Airy granite and the two are scarcely distinguishable; also in the Washington Monument there are two kinds of granite.

Mr. White thereupon expressed the views and recommendations of McKim, Mead and White, architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge. Mr. White said:

'I want to call attention to Colonel Grant's letter of July 28th, in which he favors for aesthetic reasons Mount Airy granite for the balustrade, as do McKim, Mead and White, saying--

> '---I am in agreement with you in believing that the use of Mount Airy granite throughout would give the best result architecturally, but there are a number of other factors to be considered which, in my opinion, outweigh the advantages of Mount Airy.---'.

The most desirable thing is Mount Airy granite. Mr. Merrill feels that way about it. As a matter of fact he would like to have everything, including the smaller bridge, of Mount Airy granite. Therefore we agree with Colonel Grant as to the use of Mount Airy granite for Part I, (as heretofore indicated); and Wallowell granite for Parts II and III. That leaves the balustrade. Where Mr. Merrill feels the balustrade should be a continuing thing, one material from the entrance at the Lincoln Memorial to the entrance of the Arlington Cemetery. The exact difference in cost is only $7,100. so therefore, as we wrote to Colonel Grant on July 30th, we recommend Mount Airy

granite for the bottom (Part I); Wallowell granite for the shaft (Parts II and III; and Mount Airy granite for the balustrade (Parts IV and V). I might say we have no objection to Bethel Granite, but as this portion of the bridge is being built of Mount Airy Granite we would not introduce a discordant element by using another kind of granite for a conspicuous place."

Mr. Bartholomew said it would seem to him that the different kinds of granite could be used as proposed; that the difference in cost might be disregarded. "I would favor a different kind of granite around Columbia Island Plaza from the bridge proper. It would be an interesting contrast. So far as weathering is concerned, the same kind of granite is known to weather differently in the same building in the course of time". Mr. White admitted that this was true and called attention to the Columbia University Library and the Metropolitan Club at 61st Street and Fifth Avenue, where peculiar weathering of stone has taken place. Tennessee marble has been known to weather unfavorably in the same spot. The marble in the New York Customs House, he said, is one of the most unfortunate things that has happened. "What we object to", Mr. White said, "is to introduce a different kind of stone for an important part of the superstructure of the bridge, such as the balustrade. It would be also extremely unfortunate to change the kind of granite at the approach to the Arlington Memorial Bridge or for the steps. We think the same kind of stone should be used from the Lincoln Memorial to the Arlington Cemetery and it is therefore a esthetic question for the Commission to decide. We have offered the compromise which meets the desire of introducing northern granite and gives bidders assurance that their bids are responsive". The Commission were in general accord with what Mr. White had stated.

Mr. Waglo called attention to the fact that while Mount Airy granite costs according to the latest bid a few thousand dollars more, he thought the

granite paved to a new Memorial Bridge could be brought under the original contract. Colonel Grant thought the question of whether it could be decided upon by the Washington Memorial Bridge Commission, leaving the merits of the question as to the granite that ought to be used to be decided by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Morris said: "I think Millstone Hill granite will be far decidedly different from the Mount Airy or the Bethel granite. We have all used it. I think it was used before."

Colonel Grant called attention to the fact that the cost for the arches of the entire bridge will be of finer dressed granite and that large sums of them have been cut under the existing contract. So there would be two or three different kinds of granite in the finished.

Attention was called to the local granite. Colonel Grant said it was a good thing the Commission ordered the remodeling of Aqua; that from the floors they cannot be seen beyond the third span.

Mr. Morris asked Colonel Grant whether he would object to the commission proposed by the architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and he replied that the only objection that might be considered of importance would be the fact that certain bidders didn't get the orders for granite as they might have expected. "Of course", he said, "We have the right to reject all bids and order granite under the terms of the original contract."

Mr. Delano then expressed the views of the Commission in this matter: the Commission of Fine Arts insists on using Millstone granite for the entire length of the bridge. The question of granite for Arlington Memorial Bridge is later. For the time being it is important to have the same kind of granite that is used for the superstructure of the bridge, that is Mount Airy

granite. Since the difference in cost is negligible, the composite plan proposed by the Architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge for the granite of the Cromwell Bridge is acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts'.

The Commission thereupon unanimously agreed that the composite plan, as suggested by the architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, be accepted, namely:

Part I, Mount Airy granite,
Part II and III Wallbridge granite,
Part IV and V Mount Airy granite.

A report was sent to the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission (Exhibit B)

2. Future pylon designs: Mr. Moore said he had received a letter from Mr. Kendall, submitting a new design for the pylons, as follows:

August 1, 1928.

'I enclose a copy of a letter which I have just written to Colonel Grant. You will see therein why I favor the rectangular pylon instead of the obelisk which, or so seems to me to look very well, but there will be too many of them. Therefore the rectangular mass would have less verticality and thereby not interfere with the effect of the columns representing the North and South. The chief advantage of the rectangular pylons is that while it counts for very much less against the Lincoln Memorial, viewed from the center of the bridge, the views farther up and down the river, where mass is essential, is the same as it was in the original pylons, two very important points in my opinion. I am in hopes that Colonel Grant will grant them the models of the rectangular pylons, paying great attention also to the color which would be the same as the Lincoln Memorial beyond them.'

Mr. White submitted the revised drawings of the pylons, and called attention to the fact that the size of them had been cut in half over those previously submitted; that the eagles have been omitted, which reduces the pylons somewhat in weight; that the pylons as now proposed measure---

9' 6" x 15' 0" x 40' 0" instead of

15' 0" x 15' 8" x 45' 5".

The Commission inspected the drawings; also the design of an obelisk, which was submitted as an alternate sketch, but did not favored because it

[illegible] obelisk that would be too much like the Washington Monument.

Mr. Delano asked whether a study had been made of a lower pylon, suggesting a horizontal treatment, and Mr. White replied that none had been made, as Mr. Mendell felt it would not be suitable for the bridge.

The Commission then considered very carefully the sculpture proposed for the pylons as revised. Mr. Fraser said that it is a very important problem to execute the figure which Mr. Mendell has indicated in the design, and he raised the question whether it would be advisable to have such a figure on the pylon; also, he said, there is ornamentation suggested which is not in keeping with the simplicity of the rest of the bridge. The scale drawings of the falcon and discs were then examined, which illustrated this. The inscription of course, Mr. Fraser said, could be kept on the pylons.

It was understood that models of the revised pylons would be made, to be erected at the Lincoln Memorial Plaza, and painted to harmonize with the Lincoln Memorial.

Subsequently the Commission gave further consideration to the pylons in executive session, during which Mr. Vitale strongly objected to having the pylons erected at the Lincoln Memorial Plaza as proposed, and said the whole scheme of submitting new studies of the pylons was simply trying to cover a discrepancy that cannot be remedied because the scale of the Lincoln Memorial and the Arlington Memorial Bridge differ, and no vertical pylon could fit both. Mr. Vitale said:

> My opinion is that there is such a discrepancy in scale in the bridge and the memorial that it almost looks self-evident to me that the design of the bridge, the pylons and the statues on the bridge would inevitably conflict. The best thing is to abolish the statues and reduce the pylons to a horizontal scheme without any design that would carry in the air. My feeling is that Mr. Purves the bridge should have been in keeping with the whole scheme of the Lincoln Memorial, the Arlington Memorial Bridge, the Rock Creek Park, the Mall,

...e are getting different designs designed by different men. Each one ... a separate design, forgetting the whole. I cannot see by reducing the pylons a few feet will ever change the fundamental defect in the elevation in its relation to the Lincoln Memorial. It therefore seems to be the duty of the Commission to disapprove all of these designs, to begin anew in whole; sooner or later we will have to come to that. We are just putting off. The scale of the pylons is so different from the scale of the bridge that it is self-evident the design is trying to cover up a construction fault. The pylons as designed now are doubtless different from what they were originally, and it is proposed to erect another model on them, but I doubt if it will accomplish anything. The trouble seems to be further back. The design of the bridge is at such scale that it almost stands out by itself as a magnificent piece of designing in no relation with the Memorial or the other great projects adjacent to it, which should all be treated as one composition."

The Commission agreed that the Arlington Memorial Bridge is tremendous in scale and that the treatment suggested by Mr. Little to have the projects near the Lincoln Memorial treated as one composition is the one to be desired. A report was submitted to Colonel Grant suggesting that the architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge and the consideration of the duplication of the pylons from the Lincoln Memorial plans. (Exhibit C).

3. [illegible]: Mr. Moore stated that the Arlington people [illegible] the cross which appears in the pediment of the chapel. Plans had designed for the World War Memorial Chapel in the American Military Cemetery at Suresnes, and that it would [illegible] a good deal of feeling to remove it; that doubtless Mr. Platt can find something else in its place.

Effort was made to reach Mr. Platt at his office, but Mr. Cunningham here informed that he was out of the city.

The Commission decided that the matter be brought to Mr. Platt's attention, with the suggestion that some other design be used, as possibly suitable from the present allocation (Exhibit D).

4. UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD: Mr. Moore said that Congress having authorized the erection of the Foreign Service Building

Commission for the erection of United States buildings in foreign countries (Exhibit B), information has been received informally from the State Department that the Commission of Fine Arts would be consulted in the matter of design for the buildings; that he had written to Hon. Stephen G. Porter, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, House of Representatives, and Chairman of the "Foreign Service Buildings Commission", offering the cooperation of the Commission of Fine Arts in the following letter:

July 13, 1926.

"I am enclosing a copy of the act creating the Commission of Fine Arts, and merely by way of suggestion to you, wish to say that if your Commission should desire any advice in regard to the new office buildings to be erected in Paris, the Commission of Fine Arts would be pleased to take up the matter with you.

Almost all the architect members of the Commission of Fine Arts, past and present, are graduates of the Ecole des Beaux Arts and hold diplomas from the French Government. Quite naturally they are interested in the new buildings and have a desire that it shall not only represent the dignity of the United States, but shall also be designed so as to be a home in Paris."

The Secretary called attention to a newspaper dispatch of August 4, 1926 from Paris setting forth that for one of these buildings a location has been secured at the Place de la Concorde (Exhibit H).

5. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WORLD WAR MEMORIAL. Colonel Grant submitted a section of the Howard Design for the Lincoln Memorial Grounds, showing the location of the proposed District of Columbia World War Memorial, to be a marble building south of the Reflecting Basin and about 400 feet west of 17th Street. Colonel Grant said he was submitting the sketch in accordance with the suggestion of the Commission made at the meeting on May 24th to show a suggested treatment of the knive indicated on the original Howard Plan on the north side of the Reflecting Basin; but said to move the bandstand balance it on the south side would bring it much nearer 17th Street.

Mr. Delano said he felt the site determined upon by the Commission for the District of Columbia World War Memorial was the best available on the

south side of the Reflecting Basin, and to bring it further east so as to fit the World War would bring the memorial not only nearer to 17th Street, but also from a location very suitable for a building in a grove of trees.

After consideration the Commission decided to adhere to the site agreed upon heretofore for the District of Columbia World War Memorial, and that if in the future a memorial is contemplated for the north side of the Reflecting Basin it could be made to balance the Grand Stand, with little change in the Howard Mem.

8. STATUE OF HENRY CLAY. Mr. Moore said the State Department desires the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to a sculptor for the statue of Henry Clay to be erected in Caracas, Venezuela, concerning which a letter has been received from Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State (Exhibit F). The statue has been authorized by Congress by Act approved February 24, 1927 (Public No.637, 69th Congress), as follows:

> "BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to procure, to present to the Republic of Venezuela, and to erect in the city of Caracas, Venezuela, a bronze statue of Henry Clay. Such statue shall be prepared and erected only after the plans and specifications therefor have been submitted to, and approved by, the Commission of Fine Arts, and shall be the work of an American artist.
>
> Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $41,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this Act, including the cost of such statue, of transportation, of erecting the same, and of building the pedestal, all expenditures for architectural services, and traveling expenses of the persons employed in erecting such statue, and of the proper delegates by the Secretary of State to present, on behalf of the United States, such statue to the Republic of Venezuela."

An appropriation of $41,000 has been made available by Congress in the State Department appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1930, in accordance with the Act above quoted (Public No.26, 70th Congress, page 14, approved Feb.13,1929).

Mr. Frank said that Robert Aitken had been employed - but of Henry Clay. Effort was made to avoid Mr. Aitken at the public, but it was believed he was out of the city. Mr. Frazer thereupon suggested Howard Weeks, who, he

well, is good at portraits, but could not say whether Mr. Lorimer could do justice to the figure; also Mr. MacNeil, who had done big things, namely the sculpture of the Washington Arch. Mr. Fraser then said he would recommend Mr. Edmond Quinn, Sculptor (207 East 21st Street, New York City), that there is no doubt in his mind that Mr. Quinn would produce a real work of art. Mr. Morris strongly supported Mr. Fraser in his recommendation for Mr. Quinn.

The Commission thereupon decided upon Mr. Quinn as the sculptor for the statue of Henry Clay.

7. [illegible]: Mr. Delano asked that consideration be given to the question of his successor as a member of the Commission of Fine Arts, because his four-year term of office has expired, and also because he has been asked by the Secretary of the Treasury to design one of the new buildings for the Triangle; therefore he felt he would be relieved from duties on the Commission of Fine Arts, though he regretted it as much to be a member of it.

The Commission considered several leading architects, among them Mr. Henry B. Cleaves, of Boston, Mr. Arthur C. Dies, of Trenton, Mr. Thomas Harlan Ellett, of New York, Mr. John Mead Howells, of New York; also Mr. C. C. Zantzinger, of Philadelphia, but attention was called to the fact that it was understood his firm is to design one of the new buildings for the Triangle and it was therefore thought best not to suggest him for appointment at this time.

Mr. Moore said an architect should be appointed who is in sympathy with the Washington development, regardless of geographical location. Thereupon Mr. Morris suggested John[illegible], of New York, as an architect well qualified for the appointment. Mr. Fraser also heartily endorsed Mr. Cram. The Commission thereupon agreed they would suggest the appointment of Mr. Cram.

8. BRIDGE AT GLACIER PARK, MONTANA: Mr. Vitale stated that he had just returned from an inspection trip to Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks, and that he wished to submit a sketch for a proposed bridge at Glacier Park for advice as to its design and location. Mr. Vitale explained the situation at Glacier Park, and said that he had designed a simple bridge to be located at a point where it would least interfere with the natural scenery.

The Commission endorsed Mr. Vitale's recommendations and approved the plan submitted.

In addition to his explanation of conditions at Glacier Park, Mr. Vitale called attention to certain improvements that could be made also at Yellowstone National Park, and said his recommendations have been submitted to the National Park Service. Mr. Vitale said he was highly pleased with the spirit of cooperation which he found among the officials of the National Park Service.

The Commission adjourned at 1:00 p.m. The Commission were the guests of Mr. Delano at luncheon at the Century Club.

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE AND DISBURSING OFFICER
NAVY BUILDING
WASHINGTON

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON D. C.
AUG 2 1928
NOTED

August 1, 1928.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Granite for Boundary Channel Bridge.

Dear Mr. Moore:

I am inclosing herewith a copy of the abstract of bids opened in this office on July 18, 1928, for furnishing and delivering the granite for facing the Boundary Channel Bridge, together with copies of my letters of July 21st, 26th and 28th to Mr. Kendall, and of his replies of July 24th and 30th. It will be appreciated if you will advise me as to the views of the Commission of Fine Arts concerning the propriety of using Mount Airy granite for Part I (below elevation 10), Hallowell for Parts II and III (voussoirs and ashlar), and Bethel White for Parts IV and V (coping course and balustrade).

A reading of the correspondence referred to above will inform you as to the views of this office and the architects' disagreement therewith. I feel very strongly that this matter must be considered carefully from the economic as well as the artistic point of view. As far as the main bridge was concerned, financial considerations were quite properly subordinated to artistic necessities, but I am convinced that questions of cost must be given much more weight in connection with the less important parts of the project. The economic importance of the decision now to be reached will be actually much greater than measured by the difference in bids, if the impression is created that the competition, here obtained to a high degree, is merely a form and that the award is made on looks alone. Any action that justifies this idea would cost many thousands in the stone still to be bought.

Mr. Kendall's principal objection to the awards suggested by this office seems to be based upon his desire to have the balustrade of the same stone throughout the project. His point concerning the contrast between different parts of the balustrade might be

Mr. Charles Moore, August 1, 1928.

well taken if it were proposed to make the new section of any stone but Bethel White, but it is a known fact, exemplified in the National Museum building, that Mount Airy and Bethel White soon become practically indistinguishable even when side by side. Furthermore, although the use of Mount Airy in the balustrade of the Boundary Channel Bridge would not greatly increase the immediate cost, this action would be, in effect, a notice to the granite industry that only Mount Airy is acceptable for balustrades, and would certainly make much more expensive the thousands of feet of balustrade yet to be purchased.

In view of all the circumstances, I hope that the Commission of Fine Arts will find it possible to acquiesce in the use of the granite suggested in the first paragraph of this letter, even if the combination be given also to the scheme mentioned in my letter of July 28th to Mr. Kendall (substituting Mount Airy for Hallowell in the voussoirs), and that I be advised as to which combination is to be preferred architecturally.

Very sincerely yours,

U. S. Grant, 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer.

6 Incls.

July 21, 1928.

McKim, Mead & White,
101 Park Avenue,
New York City.

Subject: Granite for Boundary Channel Bridge.

Gentlemen:

I am inclosing herewith, for your information, a copy of the abstract of bids received on July 18th, for furnishing and delivering the granite for the Boundary Channel Bridge.

You will note that the lowest bid for the whole work is that of the Stone Mountain Granite Corporation. I do not consider, however, that Stone Mountain granite is suitable for some parts of the bridge, such as the coping course and the balustrade, and I do not intend to recommend the acceptance of this bid.

The next bid for the entire work is that of the North Carolina Granite Corporation, on Mount Airy granite. This bid could be accepted with every assurance of an excellent job, but by accepting certain combinations of the bids for the separate parts of the work, a lower total price can be secured, while still maintaining, in my opinion, a satisfactory architectural appearance.

The bids which I have in mind to recommend to the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission for acceptance are the following:

Part I: North Carolina Granite Corporation	$15,000
Parts II and III: Hallowell Granite Company	149,000
Parts IV and V: Woodbury Granite Company (Bethel White)	118,900

The total of these bids is $282,900, as compared to the corresponding bids of $301,042, and $304,00 for Stone Mountain and Mount Airy respectively. It might be considered preferable, from the architectural standpoint, to award Part I also to Hallowell, but the present condition of the Hallowell Quarry makes it certain that this part of the work could

not be turned out on time. Moreover, our experience on the main bridge has shown that granite below elevation + 10 will soon become so stained as to make its original color of very little importance.

The uncertainty as to the final size and form of the pylons is now so great as to make it inadvisable, in my judgment, to include them in the present contract. I expect, however, in case my recommendations are approved, to try to include in the contract with the Woodbury Granite Company a provision which would enable us to order the granite for the pylons at a later date on a unit price basis.

Before submitting my recommendations to the Commission, I should like to know whether they meet with your approval. Please be good enough to inform me to that effect at an early date, so that the matter may be settled as expeditiously as possible.

Very truly yours,

U. S. Grant, 3d,
Lieut. Col.,Corps of Engineers, U.S.A.
Executive & Disbursing Officer.

Incl. 1 ABSTRACT OF BIDS
JCM:AA

COPY.

Mckim, Mead & White
101 Park Avenue
New York City.

July 24th, 1928.

Lieut.Col.U.S.Grant, 3rd, U.S.A.,
Executive Officer, Arlington Memorial
Bridge Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Colonel Grant:

We have received your letter of July 21st in regard to the granite for the boundary channel bridge. In my opinion if Mt. Airy granite were used throughout, we should have by far the best result. The introduction of any of the other granites would, it seems to me, be a mistake except in Part I. Any other granite you mention I think could be used there except Bethel White. Furthermore, I should regret using Bethel White for parts IV and V, because the difference would be very noticeable between that and Mt. Airy for the rest of the bridge. I can think of several granites that might be used for part I, ordinarily much lower priced granites than those which you mention, for instance, Deer Island, which we have found the least expensive granite in the market. Would it not be worth while to ascertain what the estimate for part one would be in Deer Island granite?

Very truly yours,

(s) Wm. Mitchell Kendall

W.M.K.

July 26, 1929.

Mr. Wm. Mitchell Kendall,
McKim, Mead & White,
101 Park Avenue,
New York City.

Subject: Granite for Boundary Channel Bridge.

Dear Mr. Kendall:

Your letter of July 24th, with reference to the granite for the Boundary Channel Bridge, has been received. Your recommendation against the use of the Hallowell and Bethel White granites was a disappointment to me, and I should like to request that you give the matter further thought.

I am in agreement with you in believing that the use of Mount Airy granite throughout would give the best result architecturally, but there are a number of other factors to be considered which, in my opinion, outweigh the advantages of Mount Airy.

The first of these is the apparently unanimous desire of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission to have some northern granite in the project. It was this desire that caused them to hesitate about approving my recommendations concerning the granite for the main bridge, although they finally accepted them because of the lower prices. In the present case, however, they would be asked to approve the purchase of a southern granite at a higher cost, and I am sure that only the strongest arguments would cause them to do this.

The immediate saving of $20,000 to be secured by using Hallowell and Bethel White may seem unimportant, but a recent calculation of the past and estimated future expenditures indicates that even small savings are not to be neglected if the entire project is to be carried our substantially as planned.

Another important factor is the effect of our present action upon future purchases of granite. If we reject the lower bids in favor of Mount Airy, it is more than probably that the concerns passed over will consider it useless to submit bids hereafter, thus practically doing away

with competition and leaving the North Carolina Granite Corporation free to charge whatever prices it pleases for the large amounts of granite yet to be bought. This would operate to increase costs to such an extent as to require the scaling down or elimination of some other essential parts of the project.

The Boundary Channel Bridge is of minor importance as compared to the main bridge, and it seems to me that some sacrifices can be made here which would not be considered proper for the main structure. It will be seen as a whole by relatively few people - those who are driving on the roads along the Boundary Channel. It will be at least 650 feet away from the end of the main bridge, and I doubt whether anyone standing halfway between would be able to detect the difference between the Bethel White and Mount Airy Granites in the two balustrades, even when new. Such difference as does exist will largely disappear as the granite ages and weathers. Evidence of the soundness of this assertion is afforded by the National Museum which is built of Mount Airy and Bethel White. Even in the same building the two are not distinguishable now to those uninformed of the fact.

With reference to Part I, the bid of the North Carolina Granite Corporation is very low, and I do not believe that a better price could be secured from any other quarry. Furthermore, the fact that the Mount Airy Company is now furnishing us with granite at an established rate of delivery gives assurance of prompt deliveries for Part I, a matter of considerable importance.

In view of the above, I earnestly hope that you will give this question your careful attention, and that you will assent to my recommendation that the Hallowell and Bethel White granites be used as suggested in my previous letter to you.

Very truly yours,

U. S. Grant, 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer.

JGK:AA

July 28, 1920.

Mr. Wm. Mitchell Kendall,
McKim, Mead & White,
101 Park Avenue,
New York City.

Subject: Granite for Boundary Channel Bridge.

Dear Mr. Kendall:

With further reference to my suggestion for awarding the contracts for the Boundary Channel Bridge granite to Mount Airy for Part I, Hallowell for Parts II and III, and Bethel for Parts IV and V, there is another combination which would be little more expensive and which might appeal to you as being more satisfactory architecturally.

This combination would be to award Parts I and II to Mount Airy, Part IIIto Hallowell, and Parts IV and V to Bethel as before. This would have the effect of making the arch ring and the upper works stand out a little more boldly, while somewhat subduing the spandrel. I believe that you were not entirely averse to some such effect in the main bridge when we were discussing the award of the original granite contract.

I will appreciate it if you will consider this combination in connection with your study of the question requested in my last letter, and advise me of your conclusions as soon as may be convenient.

Very truly yours,

U. S. Grant, 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer.

JCM:AA

COPY

McKim, Mead & White
101 Park Avenue
New York.

July 30, 1928.

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Lieut.Col.U. S. Grant, 3rd, U.S.A.
Executive Officer, Arlington Memorial Bridge
Commission, Navy Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colonel Grant:

I have received your letters of July 26th and 28th, in answer to my letter of July 24th, in reference to the granite of the boundary channel bridge. I have given these letters very serious attention, as I understand very well the conditions as you set them forth. The principal point in my letter was the necessity of having the balustrade of the same material throughout the whole composition. I cannot imagine changing from Mt. Airy granite to Bethel White in the parts called Part IV and V. It is true, as you say, that the boundary channel Bridge is at least 650 feet away from the end of the main bridge, but it is quite a different story with regard to the balustrade which is continuous from the Washington side to the Virginia side, only interrupted by the entrances to the plaza on Columbia Island which are ninety feet wide.

As far as the boundary channel bridge proper is concerned, although I should greatly prefer to have them of the same material as the main bridge, I think there we might consider the other granites you mention. In other words it would read as follows:

Part I Mt. Airy
Parts II and III Hallowell
Parts IV and V Mt. Airy.

Lieut. Col.U.S.Grant, U.S.A. July 30, 1928.

There enters into this question also the material of the pylons, whatever shape they may finally be, as the pylons would have to be of the same granite as the balustrade. In your proposition of July 26th, there would be an immediate saving of $20,000.00 In our proposition as above, there would be a saving of $14,000.00.

I sincerely hope that you can see your way to accepting this modification of your scheme.

Very truly yours,

W.M.K. (s) Wm. Mitchell Kendall

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

Abstract of Bids for Furnishing Granite Facing for Boundary Channel Bridge publicly opened in Room 1613 Navy Building, Washington, D.C., July 18, 1928.

Name of Bidder	Total Bid.	Bid by Parts						Extra Work (Unit Prices).					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Stone Mountain Granite Corporation Stone Mountain, Georgia.	374,788	$20,435	$57,0[illegible]4	$103,126	$50,536	$69,921	$73,746	$4.10	$4.00	$5.75	$8.00	$9.00	$6.00
North Carolina Granite Corporation, Mr. Airy, North Carolina.	$380,000	$15,000	$60,000	$103,000	$40,000	$86,000	$76,000	$3.01	$4.21	$5.76	$6.35	$11.07	$6.19
Woodbury Granite Company, Burlington, Vermont.	$399,800	$21,000	$73 700	$105,000	$37,900	$81,000	$81,200	$4.20	$5.20	$6.00	$5.93	$10.20	$6.67
Hallowell Granite Works Augusta, Maine.	$ ---	$18,000	$57,000	$ 9[illegible],000	$47,000	---	---	$3.60	$4.00	$5.12	$7.50	---	---
Averages	$384,863	18,609	$61,9[illegible]1	100,782	$43,859	$78,974	$76,982	$3.73	$4.35	$5.66	$6.94	$10.09	$6.28

[illegible]

August 7, 1926.

Dear Colonel Burt:

As a result of the discussion of questions in relation to the permits for the construction of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, held in the Office of Messrs. Mack and White, on August 6, 1926, at which you were present, the Commission of Fine Arts decided that the use of Mount Airy besides for the substructure is preferable to any change, or a change to Walnut White. The Commission feel that it would be unfortunate to travel to the [illegible] to the Mount Airy color.

The idea has been to carry the facing in the bridge structure through to its terminus in the Arlington Memorial Cemetery, so that there may be no break in the ideal dealing of continuity. The suggestions made by the architects for the use of other granite in portions of the superstructure, as indicated in their letter of July [illegible] addressed to you, seems to meet the situation in so far as costs are considered.

The Commission desire to avoid any appearance of petty and piecemeal objection, but are always ready to discuss such corrections as may be suggested for reasons of cost and expediency, and are always ready to compromise in anything except the essence. The Commission therefore approves the use of granite for the Memorial Bridge, as proposed in the letter above mentioned, as follows:

Mount Airy; Mount Airy;
Mount Airy and Mount Airy.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U.S.A. (Ret'd),
Executive Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.

[illegible]

COPY

August 7, 1928.

Dear Colonel Grant:

In regard to the pylons for the Arlington Memorial Bridge, the Commission of Fine Arts regard the revised pylons, as presented by the architects at the meeting of the Commission in their office on August 6, 1928, a decided advance of the original pylons. The Commission desire to see models of these pylons set up and done in a color that will harmonize with the Lincoln Memorial.

The Commission also have discussed with Morgan, Mead and White doing away with the pylons altogether and the use of a sculptural treatment to emphasize the beginnings of the bridge and the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, with the view to ascertaining whether such a treatment will not best accord with the great composition beginning at the Capitol, extending through the Mall, to the Lincoln Memorial, and then through subordinate thoroughfares reaching into the Park System. The Commission have in view the treatment of the large composition rather than the treatment of particular items, the desire being to get a general harmony throughout the whole composition.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D.C.

MOORE C

COPY

August 9, 1926.

Dear Mr. Platt:

The Jewish people have made strong protest against the cross which appears on the pediment of your design for the World War Chapel at Suresnes, and have requested the Commission of Fine Arts to have the cross eliminated. The Commission considered the matter at a meeting held in New York City on August 6th. We were informed that you were out of the city, which prevented a personal consultation with you about the matter. The Commission therefore ask if you will give consideration to the question of eliminating the cross from the pediment or adopting some other design in its place. Enclosed is a photograph of your design for the chapel. The Commission understood the chapels are to be non-sectarian.

Sincerely yours,

H. F. Comstock,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

Mr. Charles A. Platt, Architect,
101 Park Avenue,
New York, N.Y.

EXHIBIT D

COPY

Charles A. Platt, Architect,
101 Park Avenue, New York.

August 13, 1926.

My dear Mr. Comstock:

Replying to yours of August 9th, if the American Battle Monuments Commission order me to remove the cross from the pediment of the World War Chapel at Suresnes, I shall, of course, do so. But I understood that while the chapels should not be sectarian, that they were Christian, but if the Jews are strong enough to prevent us from using any insignia of the Christian religion, I suppose I will have to comply with their desire.

Faithfully,

Charles A. Platt.

H. F. Comstock, Esq.,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

[PUBLIC—No. 186—69TH CONGRESS]

[H. R. 10200]

An Act For the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States of America.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is empowered, subject to the direction of the commission hereinafter established, to acquire by purchase or construction in the manner hereinafter provided, within the limits of appropriations made pursuant to this Act, in foreign capitals and in other foreign cities, sites and buildings, and to alter, repair, and furnish such buildings, for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States, or for the purpose of consolidating, to the extent deemed advisable by the commission, within one or more buildings, the embassies, legations, consulates, and other agencies of the United States Government there maintained, which buildings shall be appropriately designated by the commission, and the space in which shall be allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission among the several agencies of the United States Government.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a joint commission, to be known as the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, and to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. A member of the commission may continue to serve as a member thereof until his successor has qualified.

(b) It shall be the duty of the commission to consider, formulate, and approve plans and proposals for the acquisition and utilization of the sites and buildings authorized by section 1, and of sites and buildings heretofore acquired or authorized for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries, including the initial furnishings of such buildings and the initial alteration and repair of purchased buildings and grounds. The commission established by the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922," approved March 2, 1921, is hereby abolished.

(c) The commission shall prescribe rules and regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this Act, and shall make an annual report to the Congress.

SEC. 3. Buildings and grounds acquired under this Act or heretofore acquired or authorized for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries may, subject to the direction of the commission, be used, in the case of buildings and grounds for the diplomatic establishment, as Government offices or residences or as such offices and residences; or, in the case of other

E

buildings and grounds, as such offices or such offices and residences. The contracts for all work of construction, alteration, and repair under this Act are authorized to be negotiated, the terms of the contracts to be prescribed, and the work to be performed, where necessary, in the judgment of the commission, without regard to such statutory provisions as relate to the negotiation, making, and performance of contracts and performance of work in the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated an amount not exceeding $10,000,000, and the appropriations made pursuant to this authorization shall constitute a fund to be known as the Foreign Service Building Fund, to remain available until expended. Under this authorization not more than $2,000,000 shall be appropriated for any one year, but within the total authorization provided in this Act the Secretary of State, subject to the direction of the commission, may enter into contracts for the acquisition of the buildings and grounds authorized by this Act. In the case of the buildings and grounds authorized by this Act, after the initial alterations, repairs, and furnishing have been completed, subsequent expenditures for such purposes shall not be made out of the appropriations authorized by this Act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of State is empowered, subject to the direction of the commission, to collect information and to formulate plans for the use of the commission and to supervise and preserve the diplomatic and consular properties of the United States in foreign countries and the properties acquired under this Act. In the collection of such information and in the formulation of such plans he may, subject to the direction of the commission, obtain such special architectural or other expert technical services as may be necessary and pay therefor, not exceeding in any case 5 per centum of the cost of construction or remodeling of the properties in respect to which said special services are rendered, from such appropriations as Congress may make under this Act, without regard to civil service laws or regulations and the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923.

SEC. 6. The authority granted to acquire sites and buildings by purchase shall, in cases where it is impossible to acquire title, be construed as authority to acquire the property by lease for a term sufficiently long, in the judgment of the commission, to be practically equivalent to the acquisition of title.

SEC. 7. The Act entitled "An Act providing for the purchase or erection, within certain limits of cost, of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad," approved February 17, 1911, is repealed, but such repeal shall not invalidate appropriations already made under the authority of such Act.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926."

Approved, May 7, 1926.

#435,000 appropriated July 3, 1926 in Deficiency Act. [44 Stat. p. 8

(Copyright)

U. S. BUYS PARIS SITE FOR SERVICE BUILDING

Ambassador Herrick Presents Check for $1,014,000—Notables at Ceremony.

Star 8-4-28

By the Associated Press.

PARIS, August 4.—Secretary Mellon was present today, when Ambassador Myron T. Herrick handed over a check on the United States Treasury for $1,014,000, completing the payment on the Place de la Concorde site of the American foreign service building. Representative Stephen G. Porter, as chairman of the foreign service building committee, was also present.

Benjamin Joy of Morgan & Co., took the check as the embassy's agent to convert it into francs for the actual payment, while 50 other persons of distinction in American and French life, including Senator Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma, witnessed the formality.

Messrs. Mellon, Herrick and Porter each spoke briefly on the significance of the event. Albert Lanoeil, president of the Cercle Union Artistique, the club selling the property, and Count De Cammando, the oldest member, replied. They said it was a consolation to know that the most beautiful site in Paris was going into the hands of friends, not "foreigners."

The club is entitled to remain in possession for two years, but is seeking a building for earlier occupancy so as to deliver the club to America earlier.

The American Government will adopt for the exterior plans drafted by Ange Gabriel, the architect, who designed the other famous structures in the place De la Concorde.

EXHIBIT E

In reply refer to
pR 831.413.C 57

My dear Doctor Moore:

As a tribute to the prominent part taken by Henry Clay, sometime Member of Congress from Kentucky, and Speaker of the House of Representatives, in the recognition of the independence of South American countries, the General Assembly of that State on March 26, 1926, passed a resolution providing for the participation of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in the Bolivar Congress in Panama in 1926 on the one hundredth anniversary of the First International Conference of American States; memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the purchase and erection of a statue of Henry Clay at Caracas and authorizing the Governor of the State to appoint commissioners to represent that State at the Centennial celebration.

On April 14, 1926, a bill was introduced in Congress by Representative Virgil Chapman authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to procure and present to the

Republic

Dr. Charles Moore,
Chairman Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Republic of Venezuela and to erect in the City of Caracas a bronze statue of Henry Clay, and containing an authorization for an appropriation of forty-one thousand dollars ($41000) for that purpose. This appropriation was intended to include the cost of the statue; transportation; grading of site; building a pedestal, architectural service, and traveling expenses both of persons to erect the statue and of persons delegated by the Secretary of State to present the statue to the Republic of Venezuela.

On February fourth 1927 Congress passed the following Act No. 637 authorizing the presentation to the Government of Venezuela of a statue of Henry Clay to be erected in the City of Caracas:

> "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to procure, to present to the Republic of Venezuela, and to erect in the city of Caracas, Venezuela, a bronze statue of Henry Clay, Such statue shall be prepared and erected only after the plans and specifications therefor have been submitted to, and approved by, the Commission of Fine Arts, and shall be the work of an American artist.
>
> Sec.2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $41,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this Act, including the cost of such statue, of transportation, of grading the site, and of building the pedestal, expenditures for architectural services, and traveling expenses of the persons employed in erecting such statue, and of the persons delegated by the Secretary of State to present, on behalf of the United States, such statue to the Republic of Venezuela."

And

And in the Appropriation Act for the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the following appropriation was made:

> "To enable the Secretary of State to procure, to present to the Republic of Venezuela, and to erect in the city of Caracas, Venezuela, a bronze statue of Henry Clay, as provided by Public Act Numbered 637, approved February 24, 1927, including travel, subsistence, or per diem in lieu of subsistence, $41,000".

Mr. Albert Kelsey, of Philadelphia who was the architect for the Pan American Union and who cooperated with the persons who appeared before the Committee and advocated the appropriation, has submitted an apportionment of the appropriation as follows:

Personal Services - - - - - - - - - -		$1,000.
Travel Expenses		
R.R. and S.S. fare - - - - -	$1,400.	
Local Transportation - - -	240.	
Perdiem in lieu of subsistence	1,560.	
Special and Miscellaneous - -	300.	
Travel Expenses - - - - - - -		3,500.
Transportation of things - - -		1,000.
Cost of Statue - - - - - - -		30,000.
Pedestal - - - - - -		5,000.
Preparation of site - - - -		500.
		$41,000.

In

In connection with Mr. Kelsey's proposed apportionment it may be stated that the American Charge' d'Affaires at Caracas was instructed to report just what the Venezuelan Government might be willing to do by way of preparation of the site for the statue and he has informed the Department that the Square Plaza Henry Clay had been selected as the site and that while no landscape gardener was at the disposal of the Government he was confident that the authorities would be glad to furnish all unskilled labor and material. It will be seen therefore that this apportionment is only tentative and subject to readjustment.

In order that you may have the history of this case clearly before you I am sending to you herewith copies of all pertinent papers from the Department files.

We are now in a position to consider the selection of a sculptor to execute the work of the Clay Statue and you will see from the enclosed papers that several artists have been recommended by Mr. Kelsey, but in view of the provisions specified by Congress that: "Such statue shall be prepared and erected only after the plans and specifications therefor have been submitted to, and approved by,

the

the Commission of Fine Arts, and shall be the work of an American artist", the logical course would seem to be to leave the selection of the sculptors to the Commission of Fine Arts in consultation with the Department of State.

It may be remembered in this connection that in the selection of a sculptor for the execution of the statue for the Peace Palace at the Hague it was first decided by the Department to select a sculptor through an open competition but this course was found to be impracticable as a number of our most prominent artists refused to compete in such a contest.

The Department then decided, with the approval of the President, to withdraw the competition and select one artist to undertake the work and with this end in view a circular note was sent to about twenty-five sculptors whose names had been submitted to the Department by the Metropolitan Museum of Art; the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and the Department of the Interior informing them of the decision to make a direct selection and affording them an opportunity to submit photographs of their works to be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for its advice as to the selection of a sculptor. You will remember

after

after careful consideration of the photographs submitted the Commission, with the Department's approval, decided on Mr. Andrew O'Connor as the artist best qualified to under take the work.

In view of the wording of the Act making provision for the Clay Statue it would not seem necessary in this case to get direct authority from the President but would seem sufficient and to be within the province of the Department to refer the selection of an artist to the Commission to act in conjunction with the Department of State.

When the artist is duly selected the Commission of Fine Arts will have the assistance of the Solicitor of the Department of State in drawing up a contract for the protection of the Department and the Commission. Mr. Kelsey will be asked to return the photographs and plot plans referred to in the Department's letter of June 21, to him which will be sent to you for consideration with the other papers in the case.

Trusting that you will concur in the suggestion herein contained and that the Fine Arts Commission may proceed at

an

an early date looking to the selection of a sculptor to execute the Clay Statue,

I am, my dear Dr. Moore,

Sincerely yours,

List of enclosures:

From State Senator C. B. Truesdell April 26, 1926, enclosing copy Senate Joint Resolution No. 19.

From Mr. Charles W. Kerr, March 26, 1928, with reply.

To Mr. Albert Kelsey, April 2, 1928.

From Dr. L. L. Rowe, March 26, 1928, with enclosure.

From Mr. Albert Kelsey, April 4, 1928, with enclosure.

To American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at Caracas, April 16, 1928.

From Mr. Alexander Porhownik, May 22, 1928.

From American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at Caracas, May 20, 1928.

From (Telegram) American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at Caracas June 20, 1928.

To Mr. Albert Kelsey, June 21, 1928.

From Mr. Albert Kelsey, June 28, 1928.